



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

fw
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/855,250	05/14/2001	Rich Gioscia	PALM-3556.US.P	9014

7590 05/13/2005

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Third Floor
Two North Market Street
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, LEE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2682

DATE MAILED: 05/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/855,250	GIOSCIA ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
LEE NGUYEN	2682	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 March 2005.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f):
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 03/07/2005 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3, 8-10, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ditzik (US 5,983,073) in view of Grewe et al. (US 5,625,673).

Regarding claim 1, Ditzik discloses a system of electronic devices (figures 2 and 7) comprising: a first device residing in a first housing (figures 2 and 3, numeral 14), said first device comprising a microphone and a speaker (fig. 3, 14C, 14A, col. 5, 52-55, col. 8, 29-35); and a second device residing in a second housing (fig. 2, numeral 2), said second device comprising a processor (fig. 7, 38, 48), a memory unit coupled to said processor (fig. 7, 42), electronics for wireless communications coupled to said processor (fig. 7, 54), and inherently a telephony chip set for providing telephone functionality (see col. 2, lines 62-65, col. 6, 9-14 in which voice is relayed to other devices from the first device 14) and a first display coupled to said processor (fig. 7, 44), said second housing comprising a connection means for removably connecting said first device to said second device (fig. 2, 8, col. 5, 52-67); wherein said first device is communicatively coupled by a wireless connection to said second device (col. 5, 49-52) and wherein said first device and said second device work in combination to provide the

capability for wireless communications with one or more other devices using said telephone chip set of said second device 2 (col. 6, 7-12, 33-45, col. 2, 60-65 in which voice is relayed to other devices from the first device 14). Ditzik also suggests that the cover section 8 consists of the handset itself, so that a separate cover section with recess would not require (col. 5, 65-67). Ditzik does not explicitly teach that the connection means integrated directly into said second housing. Grewe teaches a PDA/laptop housing 10 including connection means 11, 12, 14 in which a cellular phone 20 integrates directly into said second housing 10 (figs. 1-2, col. 1, 61-64). It would have been one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Grewe with Ditzik form a single integrated apparatus.

Regarding claim 3, the above combination further teaches that said first device further comprises a control element (fig. 2, 14, col. 5, 55-59, col. 6, 16-19 of Ditzik)

Regarding claims 8-9, Ditzik discloses the system as recited in claim 3 wherein said control element is operable to activate said wireless

communication and to terminate said wireless communication (fig. 2, numeral 14, col. 5, 55-59, col. 6, 6-19, note: it is inherently in the art that this type of handsets can initiate/activate/terminate wireless communication).

Regarding claim 10, Ditzik discloses the system as recited in claim 1 wherein said first device further comprises a IR-enabled transceiver and said second device further comprises a IR-enabled transceiver (col. 5, 49-52, col. 6, 37-45). Ditzik does not teach that the short range IR communication can be used as Bluetooth communication between the first device figure 1, numeral 14 and second device 2, figure 1). It is taken official notice that short range communication including Bluetooth is conventionally well known. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Bluetooth communication in the above combination so that more devices can mutually communicate.

Regarding claim 13, Ditzik discloses the system as recited in claim 1 wherein said connection means for removably connecting said first device

to said second device is a receiving slot (col. 5, 59-65).

4. Claims 2, 4, 15-19, 23-24, 27, 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ditzik (US 5,983,073) in view of Grewe as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Lehtonen (US 6,014,573).

Regarding claim 2, Ditzik discloses the system as recited in claim 1. However, Ditzik fails to teach that said first device further comprises a second display. But, Lehtonen discloses device further comprises display (fig. 1, numeral 1b). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Ditzik with Lehtonen so that the user of the device has the ability to monitor the first device capability, such as battery and signal level.

Regarding claims 4 and 19, Ditzik discloses the system as recited in claims 3 and 15, respectively. Ditzik as modified by Lehtonen teaches that said control element is operable to control the volume of said speaker ((fig. 1, numeral 3, col. 4, 26-32, 47-57 of Lehtonen). The motivation is the same reason as set forth above.

Regarding claim 15, Ditzik discloses a system of electronic devices comprising: a first device residing in a first housing (Ditzik, figs. 1 and 3, numeral 14), said first device comprising a microphone (fig. 3, 14C), col. 5, 52-55), a speaker (fig. 3, 14A), and a control element (fig. 2, 14, col. 5, 52-55, col. 8, 29-35); and a personal digital assistant residing in a second housing (col. 2, 57-65, col. 3, 50-56, fig. 1-4, numeral 2), said personal digital assistant comprising a processor (numerals 38, 48, fig. 7), a memory unit coupled to said processor (fig. 7, numeral 42), electronics for wireless communications coupled to said processor (fig. Fig. 7, 51, 54), a display coupled to said processor (fig. 7, 44), a handwriting recognition pad coupled to said processor (fig. 7, numeral 9), and a cursor control device (fig. 7, numeral 56), and inherently a telephony chip set for providing telephone functionality (see col. 2, lines 62-65, col. 6, 9-14 in which voice is relayed to other devices from the first device 14), said second housing comprising a connection means for removably connecting said first device to said second device (numeral 8, fig. 2, col. 5, 52-67); wherein said first device is communicatively coupled to said personal digital assistant (fig. 2, numeral 26, col. 5, 47-52) and wherein said first device and said personal

digital assistant work in combination to provide the capability for wireless communications with one or more other devices using said telephone chip set of said second device 2 (col. 6, 7-12, 33-45, col. 2, 60-65 in which voice is relayed to other devices from the first device 14 to other devices in the wide area network). Ditzik also suggests that the cover section 8 consists of the handset itself, so that a separate cover section with recess would not require (col. 5, 65-67). Ditzik does not explicitly teach that the connection means integrated directly into said second housing. Grewe teaches a PDA/laptop housing 10 including connection means 11, 12, 14, in which a cellular phone 20 integrates directly into said second housing 10 (figs. 1-2, col. 1, 61-64). It would have been one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Grewe with Ditzik form a single integrated apparatus. The above combination fails to explicitly teach a first display. Lehtonen discloses a display (fig. 1, numeral 1b). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Ditzik with Lehtonen so that the user of the device has the ability to monitor the first device capability, such as battery and signal level.

Regarding claim 16, the above combination also teaches that said first device and said personal digital assistant are communicatively coupled by a wireless connection (col. 5, 49-52 of Ditzik).

Regarding claim 17, Ditzik discloses the system as recited in claim 1 wherein said first device further comprises an IR-enabled transceiver and said second device further comprises a IR-enabled transceiver (col. 5, 49-52, col. 6, 37-45). Ditzik does not teach that the short range IR communication can be used as Bluetooth communication between the first device figure 1, numeral 14 and second device 2, figure 1). It is taken official notice that short range communication including Bluetooth is conventionally well known. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Bluetooth communication in the above combination so that more devices can mutually communicate.

Regarding claim 18, Ditzik as modified also teaches that said first device and said personal digital assistant are communicatively coupled by a wired

connection (fig. 2, 26, col. 5, 47-52 of Ditzik).

Regarding claims 23 and 24, the above combination also teaches that said control element is operable to activate said wireless communication and operable to terminate said wireless communication (fig. 2, numeral 14, col. 5, 55-59, col. 6, 6-19, note: it is inherently in the art that this type of handsets can initiate/activate/terminate wireless communication).

Regarding claim 27, the above combination also teaches that said connection means for removably connecting said first device to said second device is a receiving slot (col. 5, 59-65 of Ditzik).

Regarding claim 29, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 17.

5. Claims 5, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ditzik (US 5,983,073) in view of Grewe and Lehtonen

(US 6,014,573) as applied to claims 4 and 19 above and further in view of Ekel (US 2002/0002707).

Regarding claims 5 and 20, the combination of Ditzik and Lehtonen teaches that said first device further comprises a second display (Lehtonen, fig. 1, 1b) and first display (Ditzik, fig. 2, 4). The above combination fails to teach that information regarding said volume is displayed on said first display. Ekel teaches teach that information regarding said volume is displayed on said first display (see [0041]-[0043], figs. 1 and 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Ekel with Ditzik and Lehtonen so that the user can adjust the volume from a distance giving computer-based presentation as suggested by Ekel.

6. Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ditzik (US 5,983,073) in view of Grewe as applied to claim 3 above and further in view of Erekson (US 6,622,018).

Regarding claim 6, Ditzik fails to teach that said control element is operable to allow access to database information located in said memory unit.

Erekson teaches that said control element is operable to allow access to database information located in said memory unit (col. 8. 42-65, col. 6, 17-19, figs. 5-6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Erekson with Ditzik so that the user can download programs from local database easily to execute applications.

Regarding claim 7, the combination of Ditzik, Grewe and Erekson also teaches that said first device further comprises a second display wherein said database information is displayed on said first display (Erekson, col. 8, 47-55, col. 9, 3-17, fig. 7). The motivation is the same reason as set forth above.

7. Claims 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ditzik in view of Grewe and Lehtonen (US 6,014,573) as applied to claim 15 above and further in view of Erekson (US 6,622,018).

Regarding claim 21, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 6.

Regarding claim 22, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 7.

8. Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ditzik (US 5,983,073) in view of Grewe as applied to claim 3 above and further in view of Mault (US 2003/0208113).

Regarding claims 11-12, Ditzik fails to teach that said control element is a button and said control element is a jog dial. Mault teaches that said control element is a button and said control element is a jog dial ([0101], [0109], [0121]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Mault with Ditzik so that the user can dial without punching each numbers on the keypad.

9. Claims 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ditzik in view of Grewe and Lehtonen (US 6,014,573) as applied to claim 15 above and further in view of Mault (US 2003/0208113).

Regarding claims 25-26, the claims are interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claims 11-12, respectively.

10. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ditzik (US 5,983,073) in view of Grewe as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Hamano (US 2002/0166127).

³
Regarding claim 14, Ditzik fails to teach that said connection means for removably connecting said first device to said second device is a magnet. Hamano teaches that said connection means for removably connecting said first device to said second device is a magnet ([0024], [0061], fig. 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hamano with Ditzik in order to locate the device conveniently and not to lose it.

11. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ditzik in view of Grewe and Lehtonen (US 6,014,573) as applied to claim 15 above and further in view of Hamano (US 2002/0166127).

Regarding claim 28, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 14.

12. Claims 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ditzik in view of Grewe and Smith (US 6,333,973) and Holmstrom et al. (US 6,741,870).

Regarding claim 30, Ditzik discloses a portable electronics device comprising (fig. 2): a) a portable computer system (fig. 2, numeral 2 and fig. 7), comprising: a processor coupled to a bus (fig. 7, 38, 48, 60); a memory coupled to said bus for containing database applications and database information (fig. 7, 42, 60); a display unit coupled to said bus for displaying

portions of said database information (fig. 7, 44); a first wireless transceiver unit coupled to said bus (fig. 7, 32, 54, 51, 60); and b) a communication device removably attached to said portable computer system (fig. 2, 7, numeral 14, col. 5, 52-64) and comprising: a second wireless transceiver for communicating with said first wireless transceiver (col. 5, 49-55, fig. 2, numeral 14, fig. 7, 32 to 14); a microphone (fig. 3, 14C); a speaker (fig. 3, 14A). Ditzik also suggests that the cover section 8 consists of the handset itself, so that a separate cover section with recess would not require (col. 5, 65-67). Ditzik does not explicitly teach that the connection means integrated directly into said second housing. Grewe teaches a PDA/laptop housing 10 including connection means 11, 12, 14, in which a cellular phone 20 integrates directly into said second housing 10 (figs. 1-2, col. 1, 61-64). It would have been one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Grewe with Ditzik form a single integrated apparatus. Ditzik as modified fails to teach a second display unit for displaying a portion of said database information thereon and for facilitating an automatic dialing process, based on user input, using said wireless telephone communication device. Smith teaches a second display unit for displaying a portion of said database information thereon and for facilitating

an automatic dialing process, based on user input, using said wireless telephone communication device (fig. 2, numeral 2, col. 11, 20-31). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Smith with Ditzik in order to monitor message on the display and to dial without punching numbers each time the call is made. Ditzik fails teach a wireless telephone communications device coupled to the bus. Holmstrom teaches teach a wireless telephone communications device coupled to the bus (fig. 1, 28, 130, col. 3, lines 54-68). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Holmstrom with Ditzik in order to make voice call independently.

Regarding claim 31, the above combination further teaches said communication device further comprises buttons for displaying different information on said second display unit in response to user control (Smith, col. 9, 23-34, col. 10, 18-29, col. 11, 20-31). The motivation is the same reason as set forth above.

Regarding claim 32, the above communication further teaches that one of

said buttons is a talk/end button for, when activated, causing said automatic dialing process to call a number defined by selected information within said second display (Smith, col. 11, 20-31). The motivation is the same reason as set forth above.

Regarding claim 33, the above combination further teaches that said first and second wireless transceivers are Bluetooth enabled devices (col. 4, 13-16 and col. 1, 17 of Holmstrom). The motivation is the same reason as set forth above.

13. Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ditzik in view of Grewe and Smith (US 6,333,973) and Holmstrom et al. (US 6,741,870) as applied to claim 30 above and further in view of Lehtonen (US 6,014,573).

Regarding claim 34, the above combination fails to teach that said communications device has a length dimension that is substantially the

same as a length dimension of said portable computer system. Lehtonen teaches that said communications device has a length dimension that is substantially the same as a length dimension of said portable computer system (fig. 1, numerals 1, 2, col. 3, 6-20, abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Lehtonen and the above combination so that the user can pack and carry both devices compactedly.

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments filed 7/26/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the rejection of independent claims 1, 15, 29 and 30, Applicant contends that Ditzik fails to teach that 1) the second housing comprising a telephony chipset for providing telephony functionality wherein first device and said second device work in combination to provide the capability for wireless communications with one or more other devices, and that 2) said connection means integrated directly into said second housing.

In response, regarding point 1, Ditzik does teach that the wireless handset and the base unit cooperate for providing wireless communication with one or more other devices, i.e. the base unit relays the voice and data information to/from a wide area communication network (col. 2, lines 60-65), which inherently a telephony chip set for providing telephone functionality (see col. 2, lines 62-65, col. 6, 9-14 in which voice is relayed to other devices from the first device 14).

Regarding point 2, the limitation concerning the connection means that integrates directly to the second housing is moot in view of new ground of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LEE NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571)-272-7854. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, VIVIAN CHIN can be reached on (703) -272-7848.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


LEE NGUYEN 5/10/05
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2682